

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 FREDERICK W. BAUER,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C10-1176 MJP

ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE
OF APPEALABILITY

15
16 This comes before the Court on Petitioner's Notice of Appeal, (Dkt. No. 15), and the
17 Ninth Circuit's order for limited remand. (Dkt. No. 23.) Pursuant to the Ninth Circuit's decision
18 in United States v. Asrar, this Court treats Petitioner's notice as a request for a certificate of
19 appealability. 116 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1997). For the reasons set forth below, the Court
20 DENIES Petitioner's request for a certificate of appealability.

21 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) provides that a certificate of appealability may issue "only if the
22 applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." To satisfy this
23 standard, petitioners must show "that reasonable jurists could debate whether . . . the petition
24 should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to


1 deserve encouragement to proceed further.” Slack v. McDaniel, 120 S.Ct. 1595, 1603-04
2 (2000) (quoting Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)). To make such a showing,
3 Petitioner must demonstrate “reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree
4 that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner of that the issues presented
5 were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S.
6 322, 336 (2003) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)) (internal quotations
7 omitted) (further noting that this showing does not require a showing that the appeal will
8 necessarily succeed).

9 Mr. Bauer’s petition for habeas relief does not rise to the level that would merit a
10 certificate of appealability. As Magistrate Judge Donohue discussed and this Court agreed, this
11 Court does not have jurisdiction to consider his habeas petition. (See Dkt. No. 6.) A habeas
12 petition filed pursuant to § 2241 or § 2255 must be heard in the district where petitioner is under
13 custody. Hernandez v. Campbell, 204 F.3d 861, 865 (9th Cir. 2000). A district court typically
14 has personal jurisdiction over a petitioner’s warden only when the petitioner’s place of
15 confinement is within the territorial limits of the district court. Rumsfeld v. Padilla, 542 U.S.
16 426, 434-35 (2004). Here, Petitioner is incarcerated at the Federal Correctional Institution in
17 Littleton, Colorado based on federal drug and tax convictions in the Western District of
18 Washington. (Dkt. 1-2, at 1—2). The Western District of Washington has no connection to this
19 matter. As such, the Western District of Washington has no jurisdiction to consider the merits
20 and a reasonable jurist would not have resolved the petition in a different manner.

21 \\
22 \\
23 \\
24

1 It is ORDERED that Petitioner's request for a Certificate of Appealability is DENIED.
2 The Clerk is directed to transmit a copy of this Order to all counsel of record and mail a copy to
3 Petitioner.

4 Dated this 9th day of February, 2011.

5
6 
7 _____
8 Marsha J. Pechman
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24